

(1) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—Mr. Rahall, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Costello, Ms. Norton, Mr. Nadler, Ms. Corrine Brown of Florida, Mr. Filner, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Taylor of Mississippi, Ms. Millender-McDonald, Mr. Cummings, Mrs. Tauscher, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Holden, Mr. Baird, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Capuano, Ms. Carson, Mr. Bishop of New York, Mr. Michaud, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Carnahan, Mr. Salazar, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Lampson, Mr. Space, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Braley of Iowa, Mr. Altmire, Mr. Walz of Minnesota, Mr. Shuler, Mr. Arcuri, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Carney, Mr. Hall of New York, Mr. Kagen, Mr. Cohen, Mr. McNerney.

Mr. EMANUEL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMEMBERING ARTHUR "PETE" SINGLETON

(Mr. MCCRERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues of the passing of Arthur "Pete" Singleton, former chief of staff of the Ways and Means Committee, who died this past Saturday. Pete was a great guy who served this country in a variety of ways, beginning with his Marine service and ending as the staff director of the majority Ways and Means Committee for Chairman Bill Archer.

Pete retired for the second time in 2000. Upon his retirement, Chairman Archer summarized Pete's contributions. He said, "It was he who, in 1977, drafted the minority Social Security proposals, most of which later became law. Most recently, he oversaw the committee's intensive efforts during action on the historic 1997 Balanced Budget Act and Taxpayer Relief Act, as well as legislation to repeal the Social Security earnings limit."

Chairman Archer went on to describe the quality of Pete's service to the committee and to our country: "Pete Singleton is one of the most loyal people I have ever known. His first thought has always been: How does this impact the committee? He is one of the hardest working staff persons I have known and has sacrificed much of his personal life for the committee. He possesses a sharp wit and a quick mind. He is a true gentleman in every sense and a wonderful human being."

It was my privilege to serve on the committee when Pete served as chief of staff. I came to rely on Pete as a steady and trusted leader and often utilized his counsel based on his vast expertise and experience.

On behalf of the current and former members of our committee, we com-

memorate Pete's outstanding contributions to the committee that he so loved and to our Nation. Our thoughts and prayers remain with his devoted wife, Libby, and all Pete's family, friends and colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues of the passing of Arthur "Pete" Singleton, former Chief of Staff of the Committee on Ways and Means, who died this past Saturday.

Pete began his service to his country as a Marine in World War II. He joined the Republican Committee staff in 1970 as Deputy Staff Director, following two successful careers, one in journalism as a reporter and editor and one for the former U.S. Steel Company.

Pete soon became expert in the complex issue areas of Social Security and international trade. In 1981, Pete was appointed as Republican Staff Director. He served in that position until 1988, when he retired for the first time.

After spending time writing, along with serving on the Social Security Advisory Board, 8 years later Chairman Bill Archer of Texas asked Pete to return to the Committee on Ways and Means to serve as Majority Chief of Staff, a position which he held until his second retirement in October of 2000.

Upon his retirement, Chairman Archer summarized Pete's contributions as follows:

"It was he, who in 1977, drafted the Minority Social Security proposals, most of which later became law. Most recently, he oversaw the Committee's intensive efforts during action on the historic 1997 Balanced Budget Act and Taxpayer Relief Act, as well as legislation to repeal the Social Security earnings limit."

Even more poignant, however, was what Chairman Archer said about the quality of Pete's service to the Committee and our country.

"Pete Singleton is one of the most loyal people I have ever known. His first thought has always been 'How does this impact the Committee?' He is one of the hardest working staff persons I have known, and has sacrificed much of his personal life for the Committee. He possesses a sharp wit and a quick mind. He is a true gentleman in every sense, and a wonderful human being."

It was my privilege to serve on the Committee when Pete served as Chief of Staff. I came to rely on Pete as a steady and trusted leader, and often utilized his counsel based on his vast expertise and experience.

On behalf of the current and former members of our committee, we commemorate Pete's outstanding contributions to the Committee that he so loved, and to our Nation. Our thoughts and prayers remain with his devoted wife Libby, and all Pete's family, friends, and colleagues.

NINETEENTH AMENDMENT

(Mr. KAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize that it was on this day, as pointed out earlier by my freshman colleague, BRUCE BAILEY from Iowa, January 10, 1918, that the House of Representatives first voted to give women the right to vote by approving the 19th amendment to the Constitution of these United States.

The State of Wisconsin became the first State to ratify the amendment. And following Wisconsin's lead, two-thirds of the States approved the amendment which became the law of the land. The 19th amendment gave women their full rights as citizens.

It says, simply, citizens of the United States shall not be denied the right to vote on account of sex. The 19th amendment brought this Nation one step closer to fulfilling the promises enunciated by our Founders.

As the first Chamber of Congress to approve the amendment, we showed the way, and the Senate followed.

This Chamber took another historic step recently in fulfilling the promise of America's freedoms by electing Speaker NANCY PELOSI as the first woman to hold the position of Speaker of the House.

THE KUCINICH PLAN FOR IRAQ

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the administration is preparing to escalate the conflict. They intend to increase troop numbers to unprecedented levels, without establishing an ending date. It is important for Congress to oppose the troop surge. But that is not enough. We must respond powerfully to take steps to end the occupation, close U.S. bases in Iraq and bring our troops home. These steps are necessary preconditions to the U.S. extricating itself from Iraq through the establishment of an international security and peacekeeping force.

That is what the Kucinich plan which I am presenting Members of Congress today is all about. Congress as a co-equal branch of government has an urgent responsibility here. Congress under article I, section 8, has the war-making power. Congress appropriates funds for the war. Congress does not dispense with its obligation to the American people simply by opposing a troop surge in Iraq. It is simply not credible to maintain that one opposes the war and yet continues to fund it. If you oppose the war, then don't vote to fund it.

THE KUCINICH PLAN FOR IRAQ

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In November of 2006, after an October upsurge in violence in Iraq, the American people moved decisively to reject Republican rule, principally because of the conduct of the war. Democratic leaders well understand we regained control of the Congress because of the situation in Iraq. However, two months later, the Congress is still searching for a plan around which it can unite to hasten the end of U.S. involvement in Iraq and the return home of 140,000 U.S. troops.

The Administration is preparing to escalate the conflict. They intend to increase troop numbers to unprecedented levels, without establishing an ending date. It is important for Congress to oppose the troop surge. But that is not enough. We must respond powerfully to take steps to end the occupation, close U.S. bases in Iraq and bring our

troops home. These steps are necessary preconditions to the U.S. extricating itself from Iraq through the establishment of an international security and peacekeeping force.

Congress, as a coequal branch of government, has a responsibility here. Congress, under Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution has the war-making power. Congress appropriates funds for the war. Congress does not dispense with its obligation to the American people simply by opposing a troop surge in Iraq. It is simply not credible to maintain that one opposes the war and yet continue to fund it. If you oppose the war, do not vote to fund it. If you have money which can be used to bring the troops home do not say you want to bring the troops home while you appropriate money in a supplemental to keep them in Iraq fighting a war that cannot be won militarily. This is why the Administration should be notified now that Congress will not approve of the appropriations request of up to \$160 billion in the spring for the purposes of continuing the occupation and the war. Continuing to fund the war is not a plan. It would represent the continuation of disaster.

In addition to halting funding of this war, a parallel political process is needed. I am offering such a comprehensive plan today. I appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

DENNIS J. KUCINICH,
Member of Congress.

THE KUCINICH PLAN FOR IRAQ

1. The US announces it will end the occupation, close military bases and withdraw. The insurgency has been fueled by the occupation and the prospect of a long-term presence as indicated by the building of permanent bases. A U.S. declaration of an intention to withdraw troops and close bases will help dampen the insurgency which has been inspired to resist colonization and fight invaders and those who have supported US policy. Furthermore this will provide an opening where parties within Iraq and in the region can set the stage for negotiations towards peaceful settlement.

2. U.S. announces that it will use existing funds to bring the troops and necessary equipment home. Congress appropriated \$70 billion in bridge funds on October 1st for the war. Money from this and other DOD accounts can be used to fund the troops in the field over the next few months, and to pay for the cost of the return of the troops, (which has been estimated at between \$5 and \$7 billion dollars) while a political settlement is being negotiated and preparations are made for a transition to an international security and peacekeeping force.

3. Order a simultaneous return of all U.S. contractors to the United States and turn over all contracting work to the Iraqi government. The contracting process has been rife with world-class corruption, with contractors stealing from the U.S. Government and cheating the Iraqi people, taking large contracts and giving 5% or so to Iraqi sub-contractors. Reconstruction activities must be reorganized and closely monitored in Iraq by the Iraqi government, with the assistance of the international community. The massive corruption as it relates to U.S. contractors, should be investigated by congressional committees and federal grand juries. The lack of tangible benefits, the lack of accountability for billions of dollars, while millions of Iraqis do not have a means of financial support, nor substantive employment, cries out for justice.

It is noteworthy that after the first Gulf War, Iraqis reestablished electricity within three months, despite sanctions. Four years into the U.S. occupation there is no water,

nor reliable electricity in Baghdad, despite massive funding from the U.S. and from the Madrid conference. The greatest mystery involves the activities of private security companies who function as mercenaries. Reports of false flag operations must be investigated by an international tribunal.

4. Convene a regional conference for the purpose of developing a security and stabilization force for Iraq. The focus should be on a process which solves the problems of Iraq. The U.S. has told the international community, "This is our policy and we want you to come and help us implement it." The international community may have an interest in helping Iraq, but has no interest in participating in the implementation of failed U.S. policy. A shift in U.S. policy away from unilateralism and toward cooperation will provide new opportunities for exploring common concerns about the plight of Iraq. The UN is the appropriate place to convene, through the office of the Secretary General, all countries that have interests, concerns and influence, including the five permanent members of the Security Council and the European community, and all Arab nations.

The end of the U.S. occupation and the closing of military bases are necessary preconditions for such a conference. When the U.S. creates a shift of policy and announces it will focus on the concerns of the people of Iraq, it will provide a powerful incentive for nations to participate. It is well known that while some nations may see the instability in Iraq as an opportunity, there is also an ever-present danger that the civil war in Iraq threatens the stability of nations throughout the region. The impending end of the occupation will provide a breakthrough for the cooperation between the U.S. and the UN and the UN and countries of the region. The regional conference must include Iran, Syria, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

5. Prepare an international security and peacekeeping force to move in, replacing U.S. troops who then return home. The UN has an indispensable role to play here, but cannot do it as long as the U.S. is committed to an occupation. The UN is the only international organization with the ability to mobilize and the legitimacy to authorize troops. The UN is the place to develop the process, to build the political consensus, to craft a political agreement, to prepare the ground for the peacekeeping mission, to implement the basis of an agreement that will end the occupation and begin the transition to international peacekeepers. This process will take at least three months from the time the U.S. announces the intention to end the occupation.

The U.S. will necessarily have to fund a peacekeeping mission, which, by definition will not require as many troops. Fifty percent of the peacekeeping troops must come from nations with large Muslim populations. The international security force, under UN direction, will remain in place until the Iraqi government is capable of handling its own security. The UN can field an international security and peacekeeping mission, but such an initiative will not take shape unless there is a peace to keep, and that will be dependent upon a political process which reaches agreement between all the Iraqi parties. Such an agreement means fewer troops will be needed. According to UN sources, the UN peacekeeping mission in the Congo, which is four times larger in area than Iraq, required about twenty thousand troops. Finally the UN does not mobilize quickly because they depend upon governments to supply the troops, and governments are slow. The ambition of the UN is to deploy in less than ninety days. However, without an agreement of parties the UN is not likely to approve a mission to Iraq, because countries will not give them troops.

6. Develop and fund a process of national reconciliation. The process of reconciliation must begin with a national conference, organized with the assistance of the UN and with the participation of parties who can create, participate in and affect the process of reconciliation, defined as an airing of all grievances and the creation of pathways toward open, transparent talks producing truth and resolution of grievances. The Iraqi government has indicated a desire for the process of reconciliation to take place around it, and that those who were opposed to the government should give up and join the government. Reconciliation must not be confused with capitulation, nor with realignments for the purposes of protecting power relationships.

For example, Kurds need to be assured that their own autonomy will be regarded and therefore obviate the need for the Kurds to align with religious Shia for the purposes of self-protection. The problem in Iraq is that every community is living in fear. The Shia, who are the majority, fear they will not be allowed to government even though they are a majority. The Kurds are afraid they will lose the autonomy they have gained. The Sunnis think they will continue to be made to pay for the sins of Saddam.

A reconciliation process which brings people together is the only way to overcome their fears and reconcile their differences. It is essential to create a minimum of understanding and mutual confidence between the Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds.

But how can a reconciliation process be constructed in Iraq when there is such mistrust: Ethnic cleansing is rampant. The police get their money from the U.S. and their ideas from Tehran. They function as religious militia, fighting for supremacy, while the Interior Ministry collaborates. Two or three million people have been displaced. When someone loses a family member, a loved one, a friend, the first response is likely to be that there is no reconciliation.

It is also difficult to move toward reconciliation when one or several parties engaged in the conflict think they can win outright. The Shia, some of whom are out for revenge, think they can win because they have the defacto support of the U.S. The end of the U.S. occupation will enhance the opportunity for the Shia to come to an accommodation with the Sunnis. They have the oil, the weapons, and support from Iran. They have little interest in reconciling with those who are seen as Baathists.

The Sunnis think they have experience, as the former army of Saddam, boasting half a million insurgents. The Sunnis have so much more experience and motivation that as soon as the Americans leave they believe they can defeat the Shia government. Any Sunni revenge impulses can be held in check by international peacekeepers. The only sure path toward reconciliation is through the political process. All factions and all insurgents not with al Qaeda must be brought together in a relentless process which involves Saudis, Turks, Syrians and Iranians.

7. Reconstruction and Jobs. Restart the failed reconstruction program in Iraq. Rebuild roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, and other public facilities, houses, and factories with jobs and job training going to local Iraqis.

8. Reparations. The U.S. and Great Britain have a high moral obligation to enable a peace process by beginning a program of significant reparations to the people of Iraq for the loss of lives, physical and emotional injuries, and damage to property. There should be special programs to rescue the tens of thousands of Iraqi orphans from lives of destitution. This is essential to enable reconciliation.

9. Political Sovereignty. Put an end to suspicions that the U.S. invasion and occupation was influenced by a desire to gain control of Iraq's oil assets by (A) setting aside initiatives to privatize Iraqi oil interests or other national assets, and (B) by abandoning efforts to change Iraqi national law to facilitate privatization.

Any attempt to sell Iraqi oil assets during the U.S. occupation will be a significant stumbling block to peaceful resolution. The current Iraqi constitution gives oil proceeds to the regions and the central government gets nothing. There must be fairness in the distribution of oil resources in Iraq. An Iraqi National Oil Trust should be established to guarantee the oil assets will be used to create a fully functioning infrastructure with financial mechanisms established protect the oil wealth for the use of the people of Iraq.

10. Iraq Economy. Set forth a plan to stabilize Iraq's cost for food and energy, on par to what the prices were before the U.S. invasion and occupation. This would block efforts underway to raise the price of food and energy at a time when most Iraqis do not have the means to meet their own needs.

11. Economic Sovereignty. Work with the world community to restore Iraq's fiscal integrity without structural readjustment measures of the IMF or the World Bank.

12. International Truth and Reconciliation. Establish a policy of truth and reconciliation between the people of the United States and the people of Iraq.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BORDER AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, it is said that justice is the one thing you should always find. You have to saddle up the boys, you have to draw a hard line. Justice is the one thing you should always find.

Those lyrics are from a song by Willie Nelson, not quite the legal scholar most of us would think, but a true statement nonetheless.

But justice is the one thing you can't find on the Texas-Mexico border, and recent events show that.

Not too long ago, two of our border agents, Jose Compean and Ignacio Ramos were doing their job on the Texas-Mexico border, on patrol keeping illegals out of the United States.

They come in contact with a drug dealer who sees them and takes off running in his van. His van happened to

have 700-plus pounds of marijuana. That is not just for personal use, Mr. Speaker, that is worth \$1 million on the market in Texas. He sees the two drug agents. He flees, jumps out of the van and tries to cross the Rio Grande River. The facts are in dispute as to what occurs. There is a fight with the agents. The agents say the drug dealer had a weapon pointed at them. After the smoke cleared, the drug dealer gets shot in the buttocks and runs back to Mexico.

I say: Well done, border agents. Give them a medal. But that is not what our Federal Government decided to do. Our Federal Government decided to go to Mexico, find this drug dealer, a habitual offender that brings drugs into the United States, and give him immunity to testify against the two border agents, bring him back to the United States and let him testify in a so-called trumped up civil rights violation.

But while waiting to testify, he crosses the border again and given immunity, yes, a second time for bringing drugs into the United States.

After the trial was over with, both of these drug agents were prosecuted for enforcing the law, doing the job that they are supposed to. A week from today, these two border agents will be taken to the Federal penitentiary to serve 10 and 11 years respectively.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. Our Federal Government chose the wrong side in this case. They chose the enemy side in this case.

Mr. Speaker, what are our border agents to do when somebody flees, being a drug dealer, and tries to go back to Mexico? What are they supposed to do? Are they supposed to say, "Halt in the name of the law"?

Mr. Speaker, those days are over in this country.

So either they can enforce the law or they can't enforce the law. Enforcing the law on the Texas border is unenforceable. It is a lawless border because our Federal Government always chooses the wrong side.

Today, Jose Compean and his wife, Patty, were here in Washington, DC. Many Members of Congress in this House on both sides talked to them about the facts of this case and their lives and how it has been changed. All Jose Compean ever wanted to do was be a border agent for the United States and protect the dignity of this country, and he is being punished for that.

So our government had a choice, the choice to be on the side of the drug dealer or the border agents; the choice to be on the side of the illegals or the legals; the side of crime or crime fighters. And our government chose poorly, Mr. Speaker. This ought not to be.

My prior career before becoming a Member of Congress was as a judge in Texas. I heard over 25,000 felony cases of all types. And I am here to tell you, based on what I know about this case, a great injustice has occurred not only to our border agents but to our country.

Our Federal Government needs to take a stand for border security, enforce the rule of law and support those that we have put down to the border with few utensils to protect the dignity of this country.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, justice is the one thing we should always find. We had better find it on the Texas-Mexico border, or injustice will rule the day and this country will pay for it by failing to enforce the rule of law in failing to keep illegal drug dealers out of this Nation.

And that's just the way it is.

PRESIDENT BUSH MUST END HIS WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, tonight we will once again listen to President Bush as he describes yet another strategy for the war in Iraq. By all accounts from the media, the President will tell the Nation that he intends to send more U.S. troops to fight and die in Iraq.

This is not "stay the course," Mr. Speaker, this is escalation.

And at a bare minimum, Congress must find the wisdom and the courage to require and vote upon specific new authorization to escalate the number of troops in Iraq.

This is what Senator KENNEDY called for yesterday. He has introduced legislation that prohibits any Federal funds from being used to increase the number of U.S. forces in Iraq without a specific authorization of Congress by law for such an increase.

It is the very minimum we can do, Mr. Speaker, for Congress to finally take some responsibility for this war and exercise some accountability.

What do you do, Mr. Speaker, when a President fails to listen to the military advice of his generals? When he consistently changes generals when their experience and best counsel does not match his own preconceived ideas?

What do you do, Mr. Speaker, when a President ignores the recommendations of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group?

What do you do when a President, whose idea of a exit strategy is to kick the ball down field, is determined to dump this mess on whoever will be the next President of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, this President lost the mid-term elections. He lost because the American people voted against the war, and they want a new direction. This is George Bush's war, and he should end it on his watch. If he is not going to listen to his own generals, the counsel of the Iraq Study Group or the American people, then Congress must confront him and begin to deny him the means and the ability to carry out the next disastrous step of his policy.

□ 1730

It is my view that too many in Washington are consumed with saving face,